



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/148,615	09/04/1998	BENJAMIN KILGORE	MS-78	3633

27662 7590 12/24/2003
LYON & HARR, LLP
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 800
OXNARD, CA 93036

EXAMINER

CHEN, TE Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 12/24/2003

27

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory ActionApplication No.
09/148,615Applicant(s)
KilgoreExaminer
Susan ChenArt Unit
2171

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

THE REPLY FILED Dec 9, 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
Please see the attached Appendix
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: _____
- Claim(s) objected to: _____
- Claim(s) rejected: 2-23
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____
8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

Me

APPENDIX A

1. This is in response to amendment filed on 12/09/2003 (paper # 26).
2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but examiner is not persuaded that the prima facie case in the final rejection has been overcome.
3. As to claim 2, the examiner disagrees with the Applicants' assertion that Redford et al. (U.S. Patent # 5,957,695) fail to disclose the "claimed feature of at least one adjustable interface option including a single slider control that is slidably movable along a reference datum". The '695 patent specifically disclosed a slider control [e.g. the little gray box of the slider of the drop down list box (930A), Fig. 9C] which is clearly slidable [for example, via dragging the box upward/downward] along a reference datum [e.g. the cover.txt, page1.txt, page2.txt, etc.].
4. As to claim 7, the examiner disagrees with the Applicants' assertion that the '695 patent fails to disclose the "claimed feature of using dual slider controls displayed on the client display monitor having multiple boundaries for adjusting associated data values within a range". In response to this argument, the examiner points out the '695 patent clearly discloses at least one dual slider controls [for example, the scrolling-up and scrolling-down triangles of the slider of the drop down list box (930A), Fig. 9C] which apparently can be clicked by the client to adjust the associated data values having multiple boundaries [e.g. the cover.txt, page1.txt, page2.txt, etc., Fig. 9C] within a range [e.g. the page5.txt range, Fig 9C].

Application/Control Number: 09/148,615
Art Unit: 2171

5. As to claim 19, the examiner further disagrees with the Applicants' assertion that the '695 patent fails to disclose the "claimed feature of adjusting pricing data using a slider filter that is dynamically coupled to an input box so that both the slider filter and the input box dynamically change as a user configures the slider filter, the input box, or both". As discussed above, the '695 patent specifically discloses an input box [e.g., 931A, Fig. 9C] which is dynamically coupled to the slider [e.g., 930A1, Fig. 9C], when the client uses the slider control to adjust the contents of the drop down list [i.e., 930A, Fig. 9C], and select one of the listed items [e.g., page5.txt] by double clicking the data item [e.g., page5.txt], the contents of the editable input box [i.e., 931A, Fig. 13] will be updated [e.g., see col. 45, lines 45-51]. Furthermore, the '659 patent teaches that the contents of the display may comprising commercial price data of a product or service [e.g., see col. 53, lines 9-13 (claim 29)]. In addition, the instant claim did not restrict the claimed user configuration processing in any form. Thus, a double clicking of the data item by a client clearly reads over the claimed user configuration processing.


AU 2171